From: Cathy C Taylor (Services - 6) [/O=DOMINION/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CATHY25]

Sent: 7/22/2015 8:52:23 AM

To: Jason P Ericson (Services - 6) [/O=DOMINION/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Jaso232]

Subject: FW: REVISED white paper on coal ash disposal

Attachments: Coal Ash Draft White Paper REV12(7162015REDLINE).docx

Pages 6-8 deal with numbers of ponds and our plans. Earlier in the document addresses the fuel conversions and retirements. Hope this helps. Cathy

From: Bill Byrd (Services - 6)

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 3:00 PM **To:** Cathy C Taylor (Services - 6) **Cc:** William L Murray (Services - 6)

Subject: FW: REVISED white paper on coal ash disposal

Have you and Pam had an opportunity to review the revised language? Are any further changes necessary?

Thanks for your help on this. I think we're close to having a finished product.

Bill

Bill Byrd

Director - Corporate Public Policy

Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

Tel.: (804) 771-6506

Cell: (804) 921-0829

Fax: (804) 771-3643

e-mail: bill.byrd@dom.com

From: Bill Byrd (Services - 6)

Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 10:05 AM

To: Cathy C Taylor (Services - 6) **Cc:** William L Murray (Services - 6)

Subject: REVISED white paper on coal ash disposal, per our conversation of this morning

_				
Ca	١t	h	11	
uc	ı		v	ı

Thanks for your great help in sorting through the comments and finding places where we can address Carter's concerns. The revised language added this morning is in red, in the attached redlined document.

There are four major changes, most in the summary bullets on the first two pages.

- 1) We have added a fifth bullet that I believes takes care of Carter's concern that we hedge the statements consistent with what's been said in the 10-Q and 10-K documents. This language is based on the "risk factors' section of the 2014 10K which recognizes that any release would have "a significant environmental impact."
- 2) The next change is to the last bullet on page 1. It incorporates Carter's suggestion that we mention that we are following EPA's guideline encouraging closure within three years whenever possible.
- 3) Two changes on page 2 address Carter's comment that we stress that we are going above and beyond the EPA rule and that we also believe the facilities are being operated safely as-is, with testing not revealing any concerns. The language in this bullet says the monitoring "has not identified threats to human health or the environment." I also thought it was wise to mention in this bullet that we will continue to closely monitor groundwater in the vicinity of these closed impoundments in the future. This is consistent with the "groundwater" paragraph at the end of the paper.
- 4) Finally, regarding the "groundwater" paragraph the last in the paper, just before Table 3. I have rewritten in a manner which I think reflects our discussion.